

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 2—5, 9—12, 26—29 and 32—35 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1, 6—8, 25, 30 and 31 are previously presented.

C) Claims 13—24 and 36—41 are withdrawn.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Restriction and examination of all claims.

Traversal of the §103 Rejections

Claims 1—12 and 25—35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0189726, hereinafter “Kloosterman” in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0111963, hereinafter “Gebert”. In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions for processing a PDF (portable document format) document to produce a PPML (personalized print markup language) template, the processor-executable instructions comprising instructions for:

- opening the PDF document;
- **converting a PDF element within the PDF document into a variable object;**
- selecting a macro containing rules governing operation of the variable object; and
- configuring the PPML template to include a definition of the variable object, the macro and a version of the PDF document, wherein the version of the PDF document is configured as a background element within the PPML template.

Accordingly, Claim 1 recites in part, “converting a PDF element within the PDF document into a variable object”. The Applicant agrees with the Patent

Office that the Kloosterman reference does not teach the converting step. Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Gebert reference does not disclose, teach or suggest any type of conversion of an element within a PDF document to become a variable object.

Referring briefly to the Applicant's specification and drawings for background reference only, and not for interpretation of claims, the Applicant discloses converting a PDF element in a PDF document into a variable (see Applicant's paragraph [0006], lines 4—5 and many other locations). Additionally, examples of tools 214—218 (see both Figs. 2 and 3) are disclosed which aid in converting a PDF element into a variable object.

The Gebert reference fails to teach or suggest converting a PDF element within the PDF document into a variable object. Instead, Gebert teaches document rendering for output, and more particularly an XML preprocessor that applies style sheets and page segments before outputting to a printer driver (e.g. see Gebert at Fig. 1). Gebert teaches preprocessing a source document to relieve the output device of processing burdens (Gebert at [0016], lines 1—5). Advantage is obtained by page segmentation, which obviates the need to transform entire documents (Gebert, last half of [0016]). Accordingly, Gebert teaches aspects of rendering a document into a printer required format, but does not teach conversion of a PDF element into a variable object.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Gebert fails to support the rejection. In particular, Gebert makes no teaching of variables in the entire Gebert disclosure. And further, Gebert makes no teaching of converting a PDF element

1 within a PDF document into a variable object. And still further, Gebert make no
2 teaching of configuring a template with such a variable.

3 However, the Patent Office suggests that Gebert does teach converting a
4 PDF element within a PDF document into a variable object. In particular, the
5 Patent Office points to the Abstract and paragraphs [0034], [0035], [0036] and
6 [0044]. The Applicant will review each of these five areas of Gebert's disclosure.

7 Referring to Gebert's Abstract, Gebert discloses processing a source
8 document (Abstract, first several lines). The source document is configured in a
9 page layout stat structure providing formatting properties (next several lines). The
10 processing involves determining page divisions and formatting properties.
11 Multiple page objects are generated, each including content and formatting for the
12 page (Abstract, lines 9—11). The page objects are then rasterized (Abstract, lines
13 11—13). The Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in Gebert's Abstract is
14 there any discussion, teaching or suggestion of converting a PDF within a PDF
15 document into a variable object. Moreover, the Applicant submits that PDF
16 documents are not discussed and variables are not discussed. "Conversion" is
17 discussed; however, it is in the context of converting content input into a page-
18 divided configuration and rasterizing that content into output device consumable
19 data. Thus, nothing in Gebert's Abstract teaches or suggests, "converting a PDF
20 element within the PDF document into a variable object".

21 Turning to Gebert at [0034], Gebert teaches that the page objects may be
22 expressed in languages such as PDF. This suggests, perhaps, translation *to* PDF.
23 However, the claim is generally related to translation *from* PDF. More to the
24 point, Gebert does not disclose any variables. Specifically, Gebert does not
25

1 disclose converting a PDF object into a variable object. Thus, nothing in Gebert's
2 paragraph [0034] teaches or suggests, "converting a PDF element within the PDF
3 document into a variable object".

4 Turning to Gebert at [0035], Gebert teaches aspects of the page separator
5 program 14, wherein page objects are created. Gebert discusses rasterizing and
6 parsing to create print ready data ([0035], several middle lines). Gebert teaches
7 that XSL formatted objects may be converted into a device independent page
8 description language and then into raster data, in manners known in the art. Thus,
9 nothing in Gebert's paragraph [0035] teaches or suggests, "converting a PDF
10 element within the PDF document into a variable object".

11 Turning to Gebert at [0036], Gebert teaches that page objects can include
12 content in device independent presentation languages like PDF (lines 1—4).
13 Gebert teaches that this allows use of a device specific rasterizer (lines 4—9).
14 Gebert discusses the advantage of preprocessing operations up front (lines 10—
15 16). Gebert discusses aspects of page-by-page rasterization of the pages, wherein
16 the entire document may be rendered in memory before sending to the output
17 device (last several lines). Thus, nothing in Gebert's paragraph [0036] teaches or
18 suggests, "converting a PDF element within the PDF document into a variable
19 object".

20 Turning to Gebert at [0044], Gebert teaches a list of formats with which the
21 source document can be configured, including SML, PostScript, PDF and others.
22 Yet nothing in Gebert's paragraph [0044] teaches or suggests, "converting a PDF
23 element within the PDF document into a variable object".
24
25

1 As a general observation, Gebert fails to discuss variables at any location.
2 As a more specific observation, Gebert fails to discuss *converting a PDF element*
3 *into a variable object*. The Applicant sees no reason for citation of Gebert for
4 such teachings. If the Patent Office persists in this rejection, the Applicant
5 respectfully requests a much more developed discussion on where Gebert
6 discusses variables generally, and conversion of a PDF object into a variable,
7 specifically.

8 In the absence of such a discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that
9 Gebert fails to teach or suggest, “converting a PDF element within the PDF
10 document into a variable object”. As noted by the Patent Office, the Kloosterman
11 reference also does not specifically teach this element, as recited by the claim.
12 Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gebert and Kloosterman, even
13 combined, are deficient to support the Section 103 rejection. Accordingly, the
14 Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection be removed.

15 **Claims 2—12** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from
16 an allowable base claim, as well as for their recitation of elements not seen in the
17 prior art of record. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features
18 that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither taught nor suggested
19 in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

20 **Claim 25** was rejected without specificity as being similar to Claim 1. The
21 Applicant notes that Claim 25 recites, “means for converting a PDF object within
22 the PDF document into a variable object”. Accordingly, the Applicant submits
23 that Claim 25 is allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and
24 incorporates those arguments herein by reference.
25

1 **Claims 26—35** depend from Claim 25 and are allowable as depending
2 from an allowable base claim, as well as for their recitation of elements not seen in
3 the prior art of record. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
4 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 25, are neither taught nor
5 suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one
6 another.

7 **Conclusion**

8 For at least the above-identified reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits
9 that the references are deficient to support the Section 103 rejections of the
10 Claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be
11 allowed to issue in their current form.

12 The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any issues remain
13 unresolved by this Response, or for purposes of discussing the claims, the prior art
14 or for any other purpose.

15
16 Respectfully Submitted,

17
18 Dated: 21 June 2007

19 By: 

20 David S. Thompson
21 Reg. No. 37,954
22 Attorney for Applicant

23 LEE & HAYES PLLC
24 Suite 500
25 421 W. Riverside Avenue
 Spokane, Washington 99201

 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979